

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 21-5248

September Term, 2022

1:21-cv-02062-UNA
1:21-mc-00094-UNA

Filed On: March 8, 2023

Shushean Wong and David Lee Koplow,

Appellants

v.

Merrick B. Garland, Attorney General,

Appellee

Consolidated with 21-5262

**ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

BEFORE: Wilkins, Rao, and Walker, Circuit Judges

J U D G M E N T

This appeal was considered on the record from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and on the brief and supplements filed by appellants. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); D.C. Cir. Rule 34(j). Upon consideration of the foregoing, and the motions for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, the motion styled as a habeas application, and the petition for writ of mandamus, it is

ORDERED that the motions for leave to proceed in forma pauperis be dismissed as moot. See Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(3) (“A party who was permitted to proceed in forma pauperis in the district-court action . . . may proceed on appeal in forma pauperis without further authorization . . .”). It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion styled as a habeas application, which the

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 21-5248

September Term, 2022

court construes as a motion for injunctive relief, be denied. This court lacks jurisdiction over original habeas corpus petitions. See Fed. R. App. P. 22(a); Felker v. Turpin, 518 U.S. 651, 660-61 (1996). Construed as a motion for injunctive relief, appellants' motion does not demonstrate that they are entitled to the relief requested. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the petition for writ of mandamus be denied. Appellants seek an order directing the district court to docket particular submissions, but all of those submissions appear on the district court dockets for these consolidated cases. It is

FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the district court's August 23, 2021 order denying appellants' motion for a preliminary injunction and dismissing appellants' complaint, and the district court's September 21, 2021 order denying appellants' motions for relief pursuant to Federal Rule of Procedure 59(e), be affirmed. Appellants have raised no arguments challenging the merits of the district court's decisions, and they have therefore forfeited any such argument. See United States ex rel. Totten v. Bombardier Corp., 380 F.3d 488, 497 (D.C. Cir. 2004). Insofar as appellants allege that the district court's handling of this case was marred by procedural irregularities or fraudulent activity, those allegations are without merit.

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 36, this disposition will not be published. The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate herein until seven days after resolution of any timely petition for rehearing or petition for rehearing en banc. See Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Rule 41.

Per Curiam